RESTORATION REVIEW

Where the Scriptures speak, we speak;

Where the Scriptures are silent, we are silent.

—Thomas Campbell

IN THIS ISSUE:

THE ANATOMY OF A SLOGAN

THE UNDERGROUND CHURCH: A POSTSCRIPT

Volume 11, No. 2 February, 1969

Volume 11, No. 2 **Leroy Garrett, Editor** **February 1969**

A Scriptural Call for Renewal . . .

THE PEACE THAT CHRIST GIVES

Peace I leave with you; my own peace I give you. I do not give it to you as the world does.—John 14:27

In selecting passages from the Bible that serve as calls for renewal, as we are doing in this series, there is none more vital than those that urge upon us the peace that Christ gives. This one in John 14:27 is especially appropriate in that it shows that the peace of Christ is distinctive. The world has its peace to give, to be sure, but it cannot be the peace that Jesus gives. The heavenly peace is a peace that only He can give.

But what is that peace? The answer is partly obscured by the negative tone of the English world *peace,* which is a poor representation of the Greek *eirene,* a term very difficult indeed to translate. All little girls named *Irene* wear a name that is a transliteration of the Greek, but to give a suitable English equivalent, whether in a single word or a phrase, is not so simple. The idea of *security,* an overworked term in our time, could be embraced by *eirene*, but it is not a strong enough term to serve as a translation. The word *tranquility* is inadequate in that it comes too close to suggesting mere feeling, while *eirene* has reference to an actual condition or state.

Happiness would be better than either of these. “Happiness I leave with you; my own happiness I give you,” may come close to conveying the meaning, though *happiness* is also limited by our superficial use of the term. A phrase like “that which makes for man’s highest good” would be better still, or in a shorter form, “fulness of blessings.” Thus we have the Lord saying, “I leave with you fulness of blessings, such fulness as only I have and that only I can give.” When the Hebrews greeted each other (and also said farewell) they used the word *Shalom,* which is the equivalent to *eirene* in the Old Testament, they were saying something like “May God give you every blessing.” That is what We should understand “peace” to mean. It has reference to man’s highest good. We referred to the negative tone of the term *peace,* This is evident from the common idea that there is peace if there is no trouble. A nation is at peace if there is no war. Nations may have a stockpile of armaments and the entire world may be sitting on a powder keg, but so long as the guns are not firing and the bombs are not dropping, we would say that there is peace. War is not the opposite of the peace that Christ spoke of; the peace that He referred to is not the antonym of war. One may know the peace of God even amidst war, and even though there is no war in the world one may be void of the peace that Jesus speaks of.

Peace Is Totality of life

To follow theme of *shalom* through the Old Testament is to see that *peace* meant something like "totality of life." When Joseph's brothers revealed to him in Egypt that his father was still alive and in good health they used the word *shalom.* Several times it is used in reference to inquiring of one's welfare, such as Psa. 35:27: 'Great is the Lord, who delights in the welfare of his servant!" It also means to be well, a description Namaan gave of himself after being healed of his leprosy. It is used to describe such prosperity one has in abundant crops and material possessions, such as in Zech. 8:12.

The idea of totality of life or wholeness of personality prevails in the New Testament as well. The woman healed of her issue of blood was told by Jesus, "Daughter, your faith has made you well; go in peace, and be healed of your disease" (Mk. 5:34). Here *peace* means to be well, to be free of disease. Paul asked the Corinthians to send Timothy to him "in peace" (1 Cor. 16:11), which has reference to Timothy being allowed to make his journey without emotional or financial strain. Paul uses *eirene* to refer to wholeness of the person: "May the God of peace himself sanctify you wholly; and may your spirit and soul and body be kept sound and blameless at the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ" (1 Thess. 5:33). One is at peace when there is harmony between body, soul and spirit, which comes when one is ruled by God.

This is the force of the greeting which so often occurs in the scriptures, "Grace to you and peace from God." It is to say something like *God's favor rest with you, giving you the blessing of health and prosperity.* When John writes to Gaius the greeting is in different words, but the idea is the same: "Beloved, I pray that all may go well with you and that you may be in health; I know that it is well with your soul." (3 John 2)

The opposite of peace, therefore, would be something like *unwell* or *to be diseased in mind or body.* Paul speaks of such opposites in 1 Cor. 14:33: "God is not a God of confusion but of peace." Confusion can be between persons or within a person, but wherever it is God is not its author. He is not the God of disease or of poverty or of illness or of injustice. He is the God of wholeness. It is this wholeness that only Christ can give. "I have come that they might have life," He says, "and that they might have it *abundantly*." The abundant life is the peace that He offers.

To live abundantly is to live harmoniously with self and others. It is to enjoy soul growth, which can be enjoyed only in communion with others. It means to be blessed with material prosperity and spiritual health. It is to be free and happy. In Psalms 38:3 David describes the man who is without peace: "There is no soundness in my flesh because of thy indignation; there is no health in my bones because of my sin."

Peace and the Holy Spirit

The verse with which we began our study is part of the narrative that tells of Jesus sending the Holy Spirit. He promises that He will not leave the disciples desolate or as orphans (verse 18), but that He will send the Holy Spirit as another Counselor (verse 16). The Spirit will be sent in Christ's name and will teach the disciples all things (verse 26). It is the next verse that reads: "Peace I leave with you; my own peace I give you. I do not give it to you as the world does."

It is evident from this that peace, which we understand to mean fulness of life or life itself, is the fruit of the Holy Spirit. The apostle says as much in Gal. 5:22: "But the fruit of the Spirit is love, joy, peace . . . " Just as the world cannot receive the Spirit (John 14:17), it cannot give the peace (John 14:27). Neither is it our own work. It does not come through peace treaties or international conclaves. No king can grant it nor can any parliament or congress rule it. It is a matter of a man's relationship with his Creator, and through Him with all other men.

Paul makes it clear that peace is *in* the Holy Spirit: "For the kingdom of God does not mean food and drink bur righteousness and peace and joy in the Holy Spirit." (Rom. 14:17)

It is this that makes men one. Oneness cannot be a matter of unanimity of opinion or doctrinal agreement. As men are made one together in Christ they are created into a new humanity to live in peace together. Paul was speaking of the ugly separations that divide people when he wrote: "God has called us to peace" (1 Cor. 7:15). This means that He has summoned us from a world of hate and strife into a community of brotherhood where men are bound together by love. God has called us into a wholesome relationship with each other. And so Paul can urge: "Let the peace of Christ rule in your hearts" (Col. 3:15). When His peace rules, or when His life is in us rather than the carnal life, there can be no enmity between men. Factions and divisions are works of the flesh. They are sinful in that they miss the mark of God's intention, which is a happy relationship between men.

The peacemaker, for whom God reserves special blessings, is the one who cultivates the right relationship between men who are at war with each other. When Jesus sent out the Seventy, He instructed them that upon entering a house they were to say, "Peace be to this house!" He explained that if "a son of peace" is in the house there would be a positive response and that their message would be received. A *son of peace* is one who desires brotherhood with his fellow man and sonship with God.

"Blessed are the peacemakers, for they shall be called sons of God." What a blessed promise that is, and how glorious it is to make men brothers! How we should long to be sons of peace and makers of peace! This we do by yielding ourselves to His Spirit and allowing the harvest of peace to be a reality in our lives. But do we really desire to be

peacemakers? Are we too zealous for our own little religious playthings to become really and truly sons of peace?

The World's Peace

Jesus said that the peace He gives is a peace the world cannot give. This may be what Paul means in saying, "The peace of God, which passes all understanding, will keep your hearts and your minds in Christ Jesus" (Phil. 4:7). The world cannot give the peace that is real because it cannot understand it. It is not rationally discerned. There is no intellectual explanation for it. It is the gift of the Holy Spirit, and just as the world cannot receive the Spirit it cannot bestow the Spirit's gift.

But, oh, how the world tries! There are all sorts of books on how to have peace of mind and a thousand recipes on how to be happy. Fortune tellers across the land operate a multimillion dollar enterprise, all in a vain effort to ease the anxieties of their distraught customers. Astrology may be an invalid science, but it attracts millions who turn to stars in a tragic search for security.

Even more tragic is modern society's displacement of religion with secularization. It behaves as if there were no God. It seeks peace by denying the ultimate and in declaring God to be dead. Secularization has done what prison and the stake could not do in that it has rendered religion of little or no effect. Peace is measured in terms of military strength and international diplomacy. Or it is determined by the dollar or by social acceptance. All sorts of welfare plans for illness, unemployment, old age are efforts to provide security. It is all the peace that man can offer. When science fails him, all is gone. It is a poor peace.

In desperation some people turn to the churches, supposing that there at last will be peace. The disillusionment can be bitter, which helps to explain the revolts in the churches as well as on campuses and in ghettoes. Even the man in the pulpit often has an empty heart and a gnawing conscience even when the pews of his church are filled. He knows not the peace that only Christ can give.

Sometimes unity efforts, even those on a worldwide scale, are colossal failures in that they confuse means and ends.

The peace that human wisdom can. not comprehend is not for sale. It can be procured by neither gun nor purse. One cannot buy it nor can he take it by force. If a king is blessed by it, it came to him the same way it comes to the peasant. Man must learn that Christ is his only answer. Even the Church must learn that it is not the guardian of peace, but only an instrument through which men seek peace. Peace is between a man and the Christ. It is His peace and only He can bestow it.

It comes to one only through loving desire. The man who hungers and thirsts shall be filled. If a man knocks, the door will be opened. If he seeks, he will find. *Are we really hungry for righteousness? Do we really desire the peace that only Christ can give?* These are the questions that we must face.

The test comes in our willingness to reject the false peace that the world gives or that our own vanity creates. We must become more like that pitiful creature that wormed her way through the crowd toward Jesus, saying, "If I can but touch the hem of his garment . . ." Jesus knew when that poor soul reached out and touched Him. Power went forth from Him to her. Our experience will be the same. Jesus never fails the one who will turn his back on the false hopes of the world and reach out for the gift that only He can give. He will not fail us.

It is indeed a tragedy when His own church does not have peace, when even those who wear His name are diseased and estranged. It does not have to be. Both the Old and New Testaments give witness to the point we are making.

"He that would love life and see good days . . .

Let him seek peace and pursue it." —*the Editor*

⁂ ⁂ ⁂

"Declaration and Address": Mandate for Renewal . . .

THE ANATOMY OF A SLOGAN

Where the Scriptures speak, we speak; and where the Scriptures are silent, we are silent.—Thomas Campbell

In our first installment of this series on the *Declaration and Address* we described the background leading up to the creation of the most important document to emerge from the Restoration Movement.

We learned that the essay was prepared in the summer of 1809 in the home of a farmer named Welch, only two years after Thomas Campbell arrived in this country from Ireland. We observed that Mr. Campbell's family, including son Alexander, followed him to America, arriving at about the time the *Declaration and Address* was sent to the printer. We noticed that Alexander Campbell read the essay while it was yet in proof-sheets and was asking his father questions about its implications before it was ever published.

Strangely enough, the most famous slogan of the Restoration Movement, the one we now propose to analyze, did not appear in the Movement's most famous document. The *Declaration and Address* nowhere says "Where the Scriptures speak, we speak; and where the Scriptures are silent, we are silent." It was rather the slogan that produced the

document. Mr. Campbell first found the rule—the guideline that would bring the people back to the Bible—and once this was set forth he proceeded to articulate the principles implied in the slogan, which extended into an essay some 90 pages in length.

The slogan was born amidst those meetings held in the home of Abraham Altars, near Washington, Pa., that led to the formation of the Christian Association of Washington. When it appeared that a movement for a return to the ancient order was in the making, Mr. Campbell presented to his followers what he called "the great principle" that should guide them in their efforts. It was to a hushed and eager audience, common folk who were disenchanted with sectarianism, that Thomas Campbell first spoke the slogan, that came to be acclaimed by millions.

"Where the Scriptures speak, we speak," he said to them, "and where the Scriptures are silent, we are silent."

It was then and always has been a catchy, persuasive motto, one that lends itself to ready acceptance and without question. Insofar as we can determine it was original with Mr. Campbell. References to it may be found among religious writers generally. One such source is *A Book About the Bible*, where the slogan appears among statements generally supposed to come from the Bible. The author explains that it is not from the Bible, but a statement originating with Thomas Campbell.

The slogan was inspired by Campbell's conviction that nothing but a return to the Bible as the only rule of faith and practice would solve the divisive state of religion. He and his friends formed the Christian Association of Washington in an effort to put an end to partyism. To do this the creeds of men, which were but instruments of division, had to give way to the authority of the Scriptures. The churches were divided over opinions, things about which the Bible was silent, rather than over what the Scriptures actually taught. The *silence* of the Scriptures thus came to be important in Campbell's thinking.

It was indeed a vital discovery. If men are divided over opinions, matters not even mentioned in the Bible, then the *silence* of the Scriptures demands sober consideration. If men will speak only as the Bible speaks, and be silent when it is silent, what a difference that will make in uniting that which is divided. And thus a slogan was born.

The slogan impressed Campbell's followers as simple and concise. It stood in bold contrast to the complexities of the creedalism that had so long held them captive. They were receptive to it but by no means gullible. In the audience was a Mr. Andrew Munro, a postmaster, who was quick to see the implications of the slogan. What he had to say not only got the slogan off to a stormy beginning, but it anticipated a difficulty "the great principle" was to have from that point on.

"Mr. Campbell," he said, "if we adopt *that* as a basis, then there is an end of infant baptism."

"Of course," replied Mr. Campbell, "if infant baptism be not found in Scripture, we can have nothing to do with it."

The history that follows reveals that Thomas Campbell was slow to accept this, for three years passed before he followed his son Alexander in submitting to immersion and thereby, by implication, rejecting infant baptism. For a long while he supported the view that a case can be made for infant baptism, despite Scriptural silence, and that one should at least show forbearance toward the practice of it. In this regard Mr. Campbell is himself a good illustration of how difficult it. is to make his slogan work. If he could continue to see infant baptism in a Bible that is silent on the subject, how could he expect others to reach agreement as to when the Bible is silent and when it is not?

The enunciation of the slogan was a turning point in the new Movement. When Mr. Munro saw in it an end to infant baptism if it were faithfully followed, another brother named Thomas Acheson protested, insisting that a rejection of infant baptism was a denial of the Lord's words when He said, "Suffer little children to come unto me." The anticipation of giving up infant baptism moved him to great weeping. As he repaired to a side room to shed his tears, one James Foster, who was later to join the Campbells in being immersed, said to him, "Mr. Acheson, I would remark that in the portion of Scripture you have quoted there is no reference whatever to infant baptism."

Mr. Campbell continued to insist that the rule was so significant that it should be written in letters of gold *Where the Scriptures speak, we speak; where the Scriptures are silent, we are silent."* But the implications were so severe that his followers began to drop out of rank one by one, leaving only those whose break with their sectarian past was definite or who had already decided that infant baptism was unwarranted. It was some of these that continued to press Mr. Campbell to accept the demands of his own principle and give up infant baptism.

One day while riding along with Mr. Campbell, the same James Foster said to him pointedly, "How could you, in the absence of any authority in the Word of God, baptize a child in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit?" Mr. Campbell, irritated and with face colored, answered in offended tone, "Sir, you are the most intractable person I ever met."

But Mr. Campbell had his nucleus for a Movement that was to dedicate itself to the cause of Christian unity, and it is to the credit of these pioneers that they were able to keep the work alive in the face of disagreements. One can speculate at this point as to whether they should not have remained with their churches and worked for unity from within. It may have been a mistake for them ever to have formed the Christian Association of Washington, destined as it was to become another denomination even when it was not intended.

Such Monday morning quarter-backing overlooks the intensity of partyism of the western frontier. The people wanted to break away from the sectarianism imported from Europe. It was a new day and they wanted to be a new people. The route the Campbells took may well have been the only way. But history reveals that they were naive in supposing that they could *leave* their churches, organize an association as an instrument for unity among the churches, without at the same time starting another church. The innocuous Christian Association of Washington has indeed led to many parties, representing as they now do the various segments within Churches of Christ, Christian Churches, and Disciples of Christ. And we might add that this unfortunate consequence has been due in part to the impossible task of making Mr. Campbell's slogan work. The Movement abhorred and become a spectacle of division rather than a symbol of unity. It fell apart at the seams in its passion to find agreement as to when the Scriptures speak and when they are silent.

The problem is that while the scriptures are silent to one man in regard to some idea or practice they are quite vocal to another. The Bible is both silent and audible about Sunday Schools or instrumental music, cooperative enterprises or missionary societies, depending on whom you choose to listen to. One man reads the scriptures and finds them silent as a tomb in reference to those things foreign to his own practice, while another finds them speaking quite clearly on matters within his own doctrine.

One may be loyal to "Where the scriptures speak, we speak . . ." but he finds it speaking where another man finds it silent. And one may be true to the idea of being silent where the scriptures are silent, but he finds silence where another man finds speaking.

This is not necessarily the fault of either the Bible or people. Communication has always been a serious problem. Especially is this true in a situation made up of young and old, the experienced and the inexperienced, the educated and the uneducated. Some need milk while others need meat. We are all at different points on the scale of maturation. Sometimes we cannot hear the scriptures speak because of our lack of spiritual wisdom, which may come later in life. All of us have had the experience of "hearing" what a verse of scripture says to us after years of ignorance of its real meaning.

Too, the Bible is oftentimes difficult to interpret and many passages are subject to more than one interpretation. There is plainly room for different ideas as to what the Bible is really saying to us. Two men can differ without either of them being perverse. Truth is seldom, if ever, pure and simple. It can be very complex and hard to come by, and even then it is often mixed with obscurity.

Take subjects regarding which the Bible clearly has something to say. Foot-washing is a good illustration, for it appears in the scriptures as both a command and an example. Yet most of us find the Bible *silent* in this matter and so our practice is *silent.* We have our

explanations, of course, but we must be forbearing with those who distinctly hear the Bible speak of foot-washing where we find it silent.

Some of our people cannot conscientiously cast a vote for the President, others cannot join the Masons or the Elks, some cannot enter the military, and others cannot attend dances or movies. And on all these the scriptures speak quite clearly to these sincere hearts, if not explicitly then implicitly.

Many of us will find ourselves sensitive to things that are most certainly not explicitly mentioned in the Bible. Gambling, social drinking, drag racing, euthanasia (mercy killing), birth control, the use of narcotics, to mention but a few. It is probable that God's word *speaks* to us in some way regarding such problems, and so we make our decisions in regard to them. We have to admit that where the scriptures speak to one man they are silent to another. One physician lies to his patient when he thinks it will harm him to know the truth; another physician always tells the truth, leaving the consequences to God. Both may be sincere Christians and both base their decision upon what God says to them in His word.

It will be argued, as Thomas Campbell himself did, that all such things mentioned here are in the area of *opinion.* And opinions are outside the realm of scriptural authority. The Bible is *clear* about what really matters, and these are matters of *faith,* to be distinguished from matters of opinion.

This is a neat way to satisfy one's traditions, but it is hardly that simple. People differ on "what is really important," and what one man considers to be a matter of opinion is to another man a matter of faith. The old bromide of "just take what the Bible says" is as ineffective as it is puerile. *What does the Bible say?* is quite obviously the question, for what is so very clear to one man is wholly obscure to the next.

All this means that we are badly in need of analyzing what we mean by the authority of the scriptures. We cannot possibly mean that one man's *interpretation* of the scriptures is the authority for others. And few of us would look to a pope, a council, or a synod to establish biblical authority for us. Nor would all of us be willing to turn the matter over to the *Firm Foundation* or the *Restoration Review* or even to the *Singapore Newsletter.*

With the Constitution of the United States this problem is solved for us. We may differ over what the Constitution means and even confront each other in court. If I lose I can appeal to a higher court. But at last there is the Supreme Court that stands as final authority as to what the Constitution says.

Who is to serve as the Supreme Court in the Church of Christ? How is the decision about tongue-speaking to be resolved? Or pre-millennialism? Or Herald of Truth?

There can be only one answer to this. Each man's conscience is his own Supreme Court. Strictly speaking, it is not the scriptures that are the authority; it is rather our own conscience based upon the scriptures. Romans 14 makes this clear. One man who loves

God and studies the scriptures abstains from meats, while another who loves God and studies the scriptures eats meat. Both are right because both are directed by a pure conscience in their efforts to please God. Paul gives us an important truth in saying, "It is before his own master that he stands or falls." God knows the heart and He is the respecter of a man's scruples, provided they are a matter of conscience. If one is insincere, God knows, and we do not have to judge him.

What then are we to make of Campbell's great slogan? To be sure we cannot falsify its application by suggesting that we are indeed silent where the Bible is silent and speak only where it speaks. We most certainly do speak where the Bible is silent and we are silent where it speaks. So it is with all our segments and with all religious bodies everywhere.

Yet there is validity to the spirit of the slogan even when a literal application is impossible. Suppose we paraphrase it to read this way:

Where the scriptures speak to my conscience, I will endeavor to make a loving response,' where the scriptures are silent and I do not hear the voice of God, I will not be presumptuous and take God's will into my own hands.

Fellowship is possible among all God's people who have that attitude. This is to recognize that God deals differently with men, even as He speaks to them through the Bible. It also puts error in proper perspective. If error is a matter of pride or a perverted conscience, it is a very serious matter indeed, However, if one is honestly mistaken about a matter, his relationship with the Lord remains secure (and it should with us) so long as he is sincerely endeavoring to please God, for *that* is what pleases God.

We conclude, therefore, that Thomas Campbell's slogan has meaning when applied to our own personal search for the eternal verities, but that it is of no value as a rule whereby we endeavor to conform others to our own interpretation of the scriptures. There will, therefore, be times when we will encourage a brother to go on and speak what he believes the scriptures say to him, while we will feel obligated to be silent on the matter. He, on the other hand, is to be silent while others speak their convictions.

The gift of love, bequeathed by the Holy Spirit, is the means whereby this can be possible in our fractured and divided brotherhood.—*the Editor*

God is the poet of the world, with tender patience leading it by his vision of truth, beauty, and goodness.—*Alfred North Whitehead*

⁂ ⁂ ⁂

Alexander Campbell's "Synopsis of Reform" . . .

ESSENTIAL ATTRIBUTES OF RESTORATION

This series will be a study of Alexander Campbell's own summaries of what he considered essential to a restoration of the ancient order. We say summaries because there is more than one such listing. In 1837, with some 15 years behind him as an editor, he set forth a careful listing in outline form of the principles he considered most important. In 1836 he had given a less formal statement, a sort of off the cuff summary, of what he thought was involved. There are other references, of course, here and there throughout his writings, but none so well serve as "a gist of the Restoration Movement" as do these two. So they shall be the object of our study.

Both of these summaries were wrought out amidst controversy, as was the case with so much of what Campbell produced. In both instances he was answering antagonists of the Reformation who were accusing the Movement of being what Campbell contended *it* was not. So he set forth these principles in a context in which he was saying: *This is what we are trying to do.*

The 1836 statement, included in an article directed to Andrew Broaddus, longtime a friend in controversy with Campbell, is given in an effort to rally Campbell's enemies to the side of Reformation. Campbell contends here that what he seeks to do is what all sincere Christians desire to see accomplished. He therefore should have their help rather than their hindrance. It seems that he always believed, that if he could get folks to realize what he was getting at, that they would flock to his support rather than oppose him. Many of them of course did come to his aid.

It is our belief in presenting this series, based on Campbell's own synopsis of reform, that many of us will be encouraged to renew our efforts to accomplish these worthy ends, especially as they relate to our personal lives. He named seven points, extended in some instances to include others, but we shall give them as he stated them, making some observations of our own as we proceed.

1. *A more intimate, general, and special acquaintance with the holy oracles of both Testaments, to which we regard the text and textuary mode of preaching, as essentially, directly, and positively opposed,' as also the present mode of receiving members into the church upon experience, rather than upon faith and knowledge,' the daily reading of these oracles in all christian families, and the daily teaching them to children and domestics, as well as a more copious reading of them in all worshipping assemblies upon the Lord's day, are indispensable to better times in the church and in society at large.*

It is proper that the Bible should come first in his list of essentials. What is noteworthy is his conviction that once the Bible is elevated to its proper place in the life of the church certain harmful practices will thereby be overcome. If saints of God have an intimate acquaintance with the word of God, he is saying, then textuary preaching will have no

place. He passes on to his opposition to creeds, which base church membership upon experience. Knowledge of the Bible will also correct this.

Notice that he calls for "a copious reading" of the Bible in the assemblies of saints. Reading of the scriptures but no textuary preaching! Campbell did of course believe in expository *teaching* in the assembly, for he realized that the scriptures are to be explained, but "preaching" drawn from some isolated text, which usually carried one away into theological speculation, had long been in his view the ruin of the church.

He also places the Bible in the center of family life. He practiced this in his own home, and he often stressed family piety as basic to the restoration of true religion.

As we study this first point we may wonder if the church of our time is any closer in realizing this objective than the church of Campbell's time.

2. *The weekly meeting of all christian churches on the Lord's day in honor of the resurrection of the Lord, to keep all the ordinances of christian worship instituted in the primitive church by the authority of Jesus Christ amongst which the Lord's supper is the most cardinal and essential part; together with all the other acts and ordinances of social worship, instead of the monthly meeting to hear a sermon, as was at our commencement the common custom amongst the Baptists in Virginia, Kentucky, and very generally throughout the United States.*

Notice how "meeting to hear a sermon" was such a serious error in Campbell's view. He has referred to it in both of these first two statements. In the first it was caused by an ignorance of the Bible. Here it is due to a misunderstanding of the proper meaning of the Lord's day assembly. Saints are to meet to honor the Lord's resurrection, and to celebrate the Lord's supper, the cardinal institution of the Christian religion, and not to hear a sermon.

Included in his call for "social worship" would be, besides the Lord's Supper which is central, the prayers of the congregation (with various ones praying voluntarily), teaching, exhortation, hymns and spiritual songs, and at least occasionally contributions for the poor. But the task of restoring the ordinance of the Lord's table to every Christian assembly for weekly celebration was basic to his reformation efforts. Notice the implication that already there had come a change over the Baptists, who, when Campbell first began his efforts, were meeting but monthly.

The Lord's day and the Lord's supper thus were made inseparable, and both were viewed as ordinances to be restored to the church. With baptism as the ordinance that brought one into the church, one has the broad view of Campbell's insistence that the ancient order centered in *ordinances.* Baptism, the Lord's day, the Lord's supper. When Campbell began his work all three of these were in disarray in the churches, as he saw *it.*

From this view we can also better understand what he meant by restoration. It was not the church he sought to restore, for he was well aware of its existence from the time of the apostles. He sought to restore ordinances to the church. Campbell never doubted but what the Baptists were the church, or at least part of it, but they were meeting only once a month and only then to hear sermons. Seeing primitive Christianity as a religion of ordinances, he sought to restore these to the church which he acknowledged as existing in his time. He intended to start no church, nor to restore one. He wanted to *renew* what already existed by *recovering* its God-ordained institutions.

3. *A more strict and scriptural discipline in the church, a greater vigilance on the part of overseers, and a greater attention to good order and good behaviour amongst all its members.*

Campbell often expresses concern about the carnality of professed Christians. It grieved him that as often as not the lives of the outsiders were more exemplary than those who wore Christ's name. This condition prevailed widely, among all the churches. Campbell believed it was a time for repentance. The churches must be cleaned up.

Yet it is here in the area of discipline that the church has so consistently failed. There is a discipline in the scriptures, but we have been remiss in heeding it. Campbell wanted a clean church, and you will notice his recognition that this necessarily falls to the hands of the elders. "Good order and good behaviour amongst all members" is not likely to come unless we have a renewed concept of *membership.* In our day, as well as Campbell's, it is made too easy.

4. *A more christian morality in keeping covenants, fulfilling promises, in doing justly to all men, in loving mercy, in visiting and relieving the poor, the afflicted, and in being always ready for every good word and work.*

It is a mistake to see our Movement primarily as an effort to restore certain doctrines to the church. These statements that we are presenting from Campbell reveal that he considered restoration as beginning in the heart, in one's own personal life. There is no point that he emphasized more than personal piety. Like his fellow Virginian, Thomas Jefferson, his morality was that of the frontier. He believed a man's word should be as good as his bond. A man ought to keep his promises. And when the church had members whose word could not be trusted, this called for reform.

It is enough to say that Campbell wanted the professed Christian to be a *good* man. He should be tender and merciful. His life should be filled with good works. This is the simple, down-to-earth kind of Christianity that we all believe in. It is significant that Campbell gave such simplicities a place in the list of grand essentials.

5. *More gravity, temperance, and moderation, even in the use of things lawful; more self-denial, and strict self-government on the part of all who profess to follow the New Testament.*

He continues to stress personal virtues rather than doctrine and order. This is characteristic in his voluminous writings about restoration or reformation, terms he used interchangeably. The exemplary life impressed Campbell greatly, and he was equally appalled by a life that cheapened the Christian profession. This helps to explain his attitude in the controversial Lunenburg Letter, where he equivocated on the idea that one must be immersed to be a Christian. It was at about this time that he wrote that letter. It voiced his conviction that immersion means little if one's life is not truly Christian. And if one's life is exemplary of the Christian virtues, perhaps he is indeed a Christian, even if he has mistaken the true import of immersion.

In any event we need to recover this emphasis in our own thinking about restoration. It is after all *the whole man* that we seek to restore to God, not just that part that believes certain doctrines. Gravity, temperance and moderation are still noble virtues. And how much do we hear of self-denial? Campbell believed that a fruitful Christian life begins with strict self-government. We would do well to believe likewise.

6. *More piety and devotion—more prayer and praise—more private meditation and communion with God, than appear to obtain amongst the great mass of those called christians.*

This touches the heart of what it means to be a Christian. It has to do with what a man loves most, what he most desires, and what he considers most important in terms of his time and money. God, give us the wisdom of Campbell to realize that what we most need is private communion with Thee!

For some reason Campbell's Movement never became known for what he wanted most —more piety and devotion, more prayer and praise. This is why I have hope that the emergence of concern for the Holy Spirit in our time will infuse us with a dynamic that our people have never had to any significant degree.

Maybe we are too self staid—and too self-conscious along with it. How often have we opened our souls and cried Out from the depth of our being PRAISE GOD! Do we do it even in private?

Let these crucial truths grip our souls, causing us to realize that our renewal can come only from within. *Is his life full of devotion and praise to God?* is a more important question than whether he is right in "name, doctrine and practice."

7. *More enterprise, concern, and cooperation amongst all christians and christian churches in the work of converting the world, according to the means and opportunities which God has vouchsafed to us; and for this purpose especially, much, very much more love among all the brethren.*

The reference to Christians and Christian churches (he did not use the capital C) is not limited to his own Movement, but to all of Christendom. He believed that Christians are scattered among all the sects and that all the denominations could be called Christian

churches. He surely believed that these churches had grievous shortcomings, and here he names some of them. His Movement was an effort to put the churches to work converting the world to Christ, to cooperate more in their labors, and to love each other more—much, much more, as he put it.

Thus we have the list of essentials as Campbell gave them for Elder Broaddus' benefit. Broaddus had accused him of believing only in a head religion, one that neglects the heart. This offended Campbell, so in giving this list he assures his readers that *all* of this is what he has always believed and taught, and anyone who rejects what he taught would have to reject these seven points also, a thing he knew Broaddus would not do.

"We regard all true piety and morality as beginning in the heart," he said to Broaddus, "but not as continuing there." Broaddus might have taken issue with that distinction. Campbell meant of course that morality must be a matter of reason and not emotion alone.

And so we have the first list from Campbell, different perhaps than what most of those in his own Movement would have supposed him to include.

In succeeding issues we shall give his more extended, detailed statement of what he intended the Restoration Movement to accomplish.—*the Editor*

THE UNDERGROUND CHURCH: A POSTSCRIPT

In our last issue we published a report on *The Underground Church of Christ*, which was a review of some of the unorthodox activities going on among us. The reaction to the article has been most enthusiastic, serving somewhat to substantiate our claim that we do indeed have an underground church.

We thought our readers would be interested in sharing part of our mail, thus allowing them to judge for themselves the importance of underground activity. It may encourage the reticent to face up to the fact that significant changes are taking place within Churches of Christ, and to entertain the possibility that the solution postulated by this journal is both scriptural and workable. That solution is to *accept* the underground in fervent love as an important part of God's family, despite its divergence from the mainline, and to draw from it those resources of power that give it its enthusiasm, thus achieving both strength and unity through diversity.

These letters, like the report itself, indicate that dramatic changes are taking place among us. It is imperative that we react to these changes with Christian maturity. Our response to the call of the underground may well determine whether the Church of Christ moves creatively into the twentieth century or crystallizes as a nineteenth century sect. These letters, we think, say something.

Enjoyed “The Underground Church of Christ” very much . . . I am more convinced that there is something to the phenomenon of tongue-speaking after all, in spite of the two ladies who were quite gently ushered out the door at my hometown church when they tried to introduce us to their realm of the Spirit.—*Pennsylvania*

I am *persona non grata* in the churches here. If I stay in the church of Christ and do not vegetate on a pew, I will have to go underground. My personal situation makes it difficult for my family. Pray for us.—*Alabama*

Your article on “The Underground Church” was quite interesting, especially your reference to the Spiritual Retreat held in Dallas. Many of my friends attended. We have “house church” every Friday night, mostly college students. The group is “Spirit oriented.” They are anywhere from 30-60 people in regular attendance. The students at ACC are becoming aware of the group and many are very interested in this concept. So you see how close to home “The Underground Church” hit me.—*Abilene*

It is a wonderful experience for those of us who have *not* received “the baptism of the Holy Spirit” to pray with uplifted hands, also. It has quite a cleansing effect.—*Indiana*

While reading “The Underground Church of Christ” I was thinking of a song we used to sing a lot—“Lord, lift me up and let me stand, by faith on heaven’s table land; a higher plane than I have found, Lord, plant my feet on higher ground.” The Higher ground Church of Christ would have been more appropriate!—*Pennsylvania*

Last week I received an article called “The Underground Church of Christ.” It told about a meeting in Dallas where some “brethren” met and discussed the Holy Spirit . . . Why is all this going on and supposedly in the church of Christ? It is because we have for too long taught the right things and left them in the church building instead of practicing them . . . What are we going to do about it?—*North Carolina*

They (a congregation in Nashville) have their problems now. The charismatic group has some members very alarmed. Your article on the underground church was very perceptive.—*Ohio*

The report on the “Underground” was exceptionally well done. I feel very much as you do about both the positive and the negative aspects . . . My daughter was in Dallas for the Campus Evangelism. Interesting things *really are* happening, and nothing can stop them. I personally doubt that these changes will be reflected in the power structure within our lifetime, but I may be wrong. —*California*

I was most interested in the article "The Underground Church" as it has been my pleasure recently to attend a cell prayer group meeting and it was a most wonderful evening. There was the freedom to express any idea one might have without being looked at with raised eyebrows. And there was love, even when we didn't all share the same ideas. The Spirit is truly a unifying force.—*California*

Thank you for the attitude you displayed in the article "The Underground Church of Christ" toward all segments of the church.—*New Mexico*

We've had the problem here. *But your approach of sympathy, alarm, and humor is the right one.—Texas*

It is simply pure joy to know of a brother who may disagree with another's views and yet is willing to forbear in love . . . *Nashville*

Your article, "The Underground Church of Christ", was like Apollo 8—clear out of this world. I don't know when I have enjoyed an article so much. It is truly wonderful to be living in these days. I think it is wonderful that there is a charismatic movement within the Church of Christ. I agree also, with your analysis, that one of the dangers is this turning into another sect. I hope and pray such will not happen, and that the movement will remain to bless all those who find the living God in this way. I am told there is a real movement among the Roman Catholic nuns and priests along this line, too. Someone, who saw it firsthand, told me he visited a chapel at Notre Dame University where hundreds of nuns and priests were lifting up holy hands and praising God in a fashion that one might have only thought possible among the Pentecostals . . . If God's Spirit can so move on liturgical Roman Catholics and Episcopalians, surely He would be no respecter of persons and leave out the Church of Christ folk!—*Houston Space Center*

Among the responses were suggestions of reading material for those of us who have not explored the subjects in question extensively. So already we have something positive coming out of our recognition of the underground an invitation to read the books that have influenced them. Are we willing to do this? This sets the stage for dialogue, and it is a way to add more lumber to the bridge of understanding that we should be building. We are listing here some of the books that have been suggested. As I check the list, I see that I have read two of them and am now reading a third one. I plan to keep reading both sides of all issues. It makes me less dogmatic and easier to live with. Besides, since I have brothers on "lower ground" as well as "higher ground", I not only want to move freely from one level to the Other, but I want to be able to understand what I hear.

Our office does not sell these books and we do not know the prices, except that surely the paperbacks will be nominal in cost. We will attempt to stock these books for our readers if the requests warrant it.

Franklin, Ben J. *The Spirit and Spirituality in Contrast*. Santa Ana, California: Ben J. Franklin, 1967. Pp. 84, paperbound

An extensive scripture outline by a former Church of Christ minister advocating the use of gifts of the Holy Spirit today.

Kelsey, Morton T. *Tongue Speaking*. Garden City, New York: Doubleday, 1964. Pp. 252, clothbound.

A sympathetic and scholarly treatment of the current charismatic revival in Protestantism and its historical roots by a non-tongue speaking Episcopal clergyman who has done graduate work in psychology.

Nee, Watchman. *The Normal Christian Life*. Fort Washington, Pennsylvania: Christian Literature Crusade, 1957. Pp. 197, paperbound.

An analysis of what the abundant life in the Spirit ought to be.

Sanford, Agnes. *The Healing Gifts of the Spirit*. Philadelphia: J. P. Lippincott, 1966. Pp. 222, clothbound.

An intelligent and practical discussion of spiritual gifts by the wife of an Episcopal minister.

Sherrill, John L. *They Speak with Other Tongues*. Spire Books. Westwood, New Jersey: Revell, 1965. Pp. 140, paperbound.

A reporter's account of his investigation and experience of the "baptism in the Holy Spirit."

Wilkerson, David. *The Cross and the Switchblade*. Spire Books. Westwood, New Jersey: Revell, 1964. Pp. 174, paperbound.

The dramatic account of a Pentecostal preacher's mission to dope addicts in the New York slums.

⁂ ⁂ ⁂

EXCHANGE WITH READERS

The Meyers Piece"

Resurrection Morning: What Happened?" left me cold. I'm not very smart. And there are many things I can't explain. I'm not a Bible worshiper. But it seems to me that the position Robert has taken leaves us with logical doubts about a literal resurrection.—*Texas*

I want to particularly compliment you for the thought-provoking essay by Robert Meyers. I suppose that most C of C people who read the article will simply shrug off the implications that arise from such an article without giving any serious thought to the questions that need answering. The anomalies contained in the synoptic writings on the resurrection are but one example of many such problems.—*Alabama*

I appreciated brother Meyers' article.—*Illinois*

Cancel my subscription!—*Missouri.*

Prof. Meyers said the following in his essay: "What then are we left with? It seems to me that the one tremendously significant thing on which all four writers agree is this: *Jesus arose*".—*Ed.*

Other Reactions

I appreciate the way *Restoration Review* stimulates my thinking, whether I agree or not.—*Iowa*

In the November issue you speak of unity, and how the churches of Christ as a whole are not looking for unity in the religious world. I do not feel from reading your publication that you desire unity even among congregations of the body of Christ, unless they are willing to do as you say and do as you will . . . I have, no desire to receive it. My wife and I have high standards for the reading matter that comes into our home and your publication does not meet these standards.—*Nebraska*

We are convinced that there are among us that are weary of our ways, and one purpose of this journal is to encourage such ones to remain with the Church of Christ and work peacefully for the unity that can be ours in Christ. If this does not make for a reasonably constructive publication, we can only say that we are sorry.—*Ed.*

Leroy, I long ago got over being impressed with the "little learning" we human beings obtain in this life. Rather, my dear Leroy, it is the Divine Revelation from God, through His Word, as made alive by the Holy Spirit, that makes the difference.—*Dallas*

I frequently get such admonitions, and I presume them to be always in order, but is there anything in what I write that suggests that I place education or "the wisdom of this world" above the Word or the influence of the Spirit?—*Ed*.

From Non-Class Segment

I agree with your overall appeal. The control of the Holy Spirit in our lives shows itself most importantly in "love, joy, peace." It is our affair to try to give Christ our lives so that He through His Spirit can produce that fruit.—*Kansas*

A broadside approach (to fellowship) will bring open rupture and division, and the Old Guard will bring it without a qualm of conscience. We tend to be in a hurry sometimes. There must be some way to enjoy a fellowship of the Spirit apart from the formal services and corporate structures, or else open division would be the only course. You and Carl Ketcherside have presented something similar to what has been on my mind for a time. Would this fellowship be somewhat eclective?.. We have talked about starting a private meeting in this area which would bridge quite a few lines.—*state of residence withheld.*

Changes are taking place throughout discipledom, including the various groups of non-class Churches of Christ, from which these two responses come. The letter from which the first paragraph was lifted made reference to better relationship between class and non-class folk. They do not now think so much in terms of stealing sheep from each other!

The second paragraph comes from an editor among these people, so when he refers to "the Old Guard" it is a different power structure from the one I refer to when I use the term. I am sure he knows whereof he speaks when he says the Old Guard had rather wreck the church than to unite with those they have so long opposed.

His reference to the possibility of private meetings and a fellowship apart from "formal services and corporate structures", confirms what we are saying about the necessity of an underground. Either such ones must leave the Church of Christ and start over, which only leads to still another faction, or they must go underground, where they can both enjoy the fellowship for which they yearn and *peaceably* work for oneness of all believers. In asking whether such a fellowship would be *eclective,* I think he's asking if it would be too diverse. Fellowship is between *fellows* who are in Christ together. They may be as different in their thinking as are brothers in a family, but still they are one in Christ. Unity in diversity is the only kind of unity there can be. Anything else would be mere conformity, which stifles the individuality of the Christian.—*Ed.*

⁂ ⁂ ⁂

BOOK NOTES

We are sorry that we have no more copies of Warren Lewis' *The Lord's Supper* and that many orders went unfilled. The book is now out of print. We are, however, asking an astute brother to write an impression of the little volume, which we intend to publish in our next issue. This will enable you to know at least something about the uniqueness of Lewis' approach.

The Jerusalem Bible is now one of the more popular translations of the entire Bible. It reads with a new freshness. It contains the apocrypha, which is not easily available to the average reader. The introductions to the various books are brilliant and the notes are scholarly and helpful. It is beautifully bound and boxed, making an ideal gift for someone who likes things on the unique side. This book is to advance in price, but for now our price is 16.95. You can buy it on our Credit Plan of 5.00 monthly with no carrying charge.

Freedom in Modern Theology by Robert T. Osborn is an analysis of the theological thought of the makers of modern theology Tillich, Barth, Bultmann and Berdyaev. Along with this study he takes a look at what theology will be in the future. The author is concerned with the question of Christian freedom, and this is the problem he places before each of the great theologians. He asks such questions as *For what is man free?, From what is he free?,* and *How does Christ set him free?* He finds strengths and weaknesses in the thought of each of the theologians, but concludes that Berdyaev has the most acceptable view. This is a book for the thinking Christian who wants to know what is going on in the world of theology. 6.95

We keep selling *Making Ethical Decisions* by Howard Clark Kee, an attractive paperback for only 1.00. The chapters on "How to get around the law" and "There must be a better way to make a living!" make the volume worth owning.

Are You Going to Church More but Enjoying It Less? by Gary Freeman is one of those Church of Christ publications that Church of Christ journals do not refer to except in a negative way. Its life on the open market may be short. So you'd better get a copy while you can. If you start reading the likes of "If the bathing suits. . ." , "Are you beat?" and "Age of the pill" (those are chapter titles!), you will not likely stop reading. 2.95 in paperback.

The Meaning of Life in Five Great Religions is a title we have mentioned before and it has become a popular item with folk who know too little about Hinduism, Buddhism, Islam and Judaism. This book is not the usual dull treatment of oriental thought, but a clear presentation of what these people really believe and what life means to them. 1.95 in paperback.

Every heir of the Restoration Movement should have a copy of the most articulate history of that Movement, which is *Christians Only* by James DeForest Murch. It is so recent in its coverage and so careful to include all aspects of the Movement that it even

mentions *Restoration Review.* You will appreciate his analysis of our divisions and of our potential for the future. 400 pages but only 3.50 in handsome paperback.

Our offer of three books by William Barclay for only 7.00 proved so successful that we are repeating it. The titles are *The Promise of the Spirit, Many Witnesses, One Lord,* and *Turning to God.* Believe me, these will be important additions to your library.

The First Christian Drama by John Wick Bowman is a study of the book of Revelation. Viewing the Apocalypse as both history and drama, the author sets forth John's philosophy of history in a play of seven acts and seven scenes, all transpiring upon a cosmic stage. On opening the book one finds a new translation on one page and comments upon it on the other. In viewing the book as a drama in no wise means that the author does not find meaning and relevance for our time, for it is precisely in seeing it as *historical* drama that the meaning comes to life. Only 1.75 in colorful paperback.

Voices of Concern by Robert Meyers is likely to be out of print within a few months. There cannot be another edition, so this book is destined to be a much sought after volume. You should nor neglect getting a copy, for it is surely the most important book of this decade to be issued by our people. 3.50

Simple Trusting Faith is a personal apologetic (defense of the faith) by Carl Ketcherside. The title is drawn from the author's childhood memories of the hymn that contains those words *simple trusting faith.* Starting with his childhood faith, he goes on to discuss several problems of doubt that confront the believer in our skeptical world. The book is barely off the press, so you will be among the first to read this new book by a most provocative author. 3.50

We can also send you for 3.00 each the bound volumes of Carl Ketcherside's *Mission Messenger.* If you do not have these, why not let us send you all seven of the volumes now available, and you can pay for them at 5.00 a month with no carrying charges. No one else offers a bargain like that! If you lack only *Apples of Gold* (1967) or *God's Community* (1968), we will send these at only 3.00 each.

For only 2.00 each you can get *The Fool of God,* Louis Cochran's account of Alexander Campbell, and *Raccoon John Smith,* the story of the Kentucky pioneer evangelist. These are great reading, and if you are a "Campbellite" and have not read these books, your neglect is a sin. Repent!

We will send you a fistful of back issues of *Restoration Review* (mixed numbers) at ten cents each, plus postage, if you plan to hand them to others.

The Quest of God, the bound volume of this journal for 1968, will soon be ready. Reserve your copy now, please, though you need send no money. You will be billed. This is a 200-page book on important religious themes, with its own introduction, table of contents, and colorful dust jacket illustrating God's quest of man.

Restoration Review is published each month, except July and August, 20 pages each issue, and the subscription rate is only 1.00. We urge you to subscribe for two years at a time. Remember our club rate of only 50 cents per name in groups of 6 or more.

RESTORATION REVIEW, 1201 Windsor Dr., Denton, Texas 76201

⁂ ⁂ ⁂

RESTORATION REVIEW is published monthly (except July and August) at 1201 Windsor Dr., Denton, Texas. Leroy Garrett, Editor. Second class permit at Denton, Texas. Subscription rate is $1.00 per annum; 50 cents in clubs of 6 or more.

Address all mail to: 1201 Windsor Drive, Denton, Texas 76201.*